Art Unit: 2654

Docket No.: 2001-0105

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

By this amendment, claims 1-26 are pending, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 9, 13 and 14 having been amended, and claims 21-26 having been newly added.

Response to Amendment

On page 2 of the present Office Action, the Examiner discussed Applicants' arguments, filed on April 14, 2005, regarding the Office Action of February 14, 2005.

Applicants wish to point out that the Office Action addressed Applicants' response to the Office Action of April 14, 2005, filed on July 14, 1004.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4, 5 and 9-19

On page 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 5 and 9-19 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,418,411 to Gong in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,864,810 to Digalakis et al. ("Digalakis") and further in view of U.S Patent No. 6,289,309 to deVries. Applicants submit that amended independent claims 1, 5, 9, 13 and 14 obviate the rejection.

Amended independent claim 1 is directed to a method of dynamic re-configurable speech recognition. The method includes, among other things, determining an identity of a speaker based, at least in part, on a user identifier, and adapting a speech recognition model based on user-specific transformations corresponding to the determined identity of the speaker and on at least one of a background model or a transducer model. Applicants submit that <u>Gong</u> does not disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features required by amended claim 1. Further, Applicants submit that <u>Digalakis</u> as well as <u>deVries</u> also fail to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features of claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that <u>Gong</u>,

Art Unit: 2654

Docket No.: 2001-0105

<u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> fail to disclose or suggest the above-mentioned features of claim 1, either separately or in any combination. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 4 depends from claim 1 as a base claim and is patentable over <u>Gong</u> in view of <u>Digalakis</u> and further in view of <u>deVries</u> for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 4 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 5 is directed to a system for dynamic re-configurable speech recognition. The system includes, among other things, a controller adapted to determine an identity of a speaker based, at least in part on a user identifier and to apply user-specific transformations, corresponding to the identity of the speaker, to the speech recognition model. Applicants submit that claim 5 is patentable over Gong, Digalakis and deVries for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 5 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 9 is directed to a carrier wave encoded to transmit a control program that includes, among other things, instructions for determining an identity of a speaker based, at least in part, on a user identifier and instructions for adapting a speech recognition model based on user-specific transformations corresponding to the determined identity of the speaker and on at least one of a background model or a transducer model.

Applicants submit that these features are similar to features of claim 1 and that claim 9 is patentable over Gong, Digalakis and DeVries for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 9 be withdrawn.

Claims 10-12 depend from claim 9 as a base claim and are patentable over <u>Gong</u>,

<u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 9. Therefore,

Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 10-12 be withdrawn.

Art Unit: 2654

Docket No.:2001-0105

Amended independent claim 13 is directed to a computer readable medium that includes computer-readable program code to perform a method. The method includes, among other things, determining an identity of a speaker based, at least in part, on a user identifier and adapting a speech recognition model based on user-specific transformations corresponding to the determined identity of the speaker and on at least one of a background model or a transducer model. Applicants submit that these features are similar to features of claim 1. Applicants submit that claim 13 is patentable over <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> for at least reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 13 be withdrawn.

Claim 17 depends from claim 13 and is patentable over <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 13. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 17 be withdrawn.

Amended independent claim 14 recites features similar to those of claim 1 and is patentable over <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> for reasons similar to those provided with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 14 be withdrawn.

Claims 18 and 19 depend from claim 14 and are patentable over <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 18 and 19 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 2, 6, 8 and 20

On page 14 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2, 6, 8 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Gong, Digalakis and de Vries and further in view of published U.S Patent Application, Publication No. 2002/0052742 to Thrasher et al. ("Thrasher"). Applicants submit that amended independent claims 1, 5 and 14 obviate the rejection.

Art Unit: 2654

Docket No.: 2001-0105

Claim 2 depends from claim 1, which is patentable over <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1. Applicants submit that <u>Thrasher</u> fails to satisfy the deficiencies of <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u>. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn.

Claims 6, 8 and 20 depend from either claim 5 or claim 14, as a base claim, and are patentable over <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u> for either the reasons provided with respect to claim 5 or the reasons provided with respect to claim 14. Applicants submit that <u>Thrasher</u> fails to satisfy the deficiencies of <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u> and <u>deVries</u>. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 6, 8 and 20 be withdrawn.

Rejection of Claims 3 and 7

On page 18 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 3 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over <u>Gong</u>, <u>Digalakis</u>, <u>deVries</u> and <u>Thrasher</u>, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,712,957 to <u>Waibel et al.</u> ("<u>Waibel</u>"). Applicants submit that amended claims 1 and 5 obviate the rejection.

Claims 3 and 7 from claims 1 and 5, respectively, as base claims, and are patentable over Gong, Digalakis and deVries for at least the reasons provided with respect to claim 1.

Applicants submit that Thrasher and Waibel fail to satisfy the deficiencies of Gong, Digalakis and deVries. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 3 and 7 be withdrawn.

New Claims 21-26

New claims 21-26 depend from one of claims 1, 5 and 14, and are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claims 1, 5 and 14.

Art Unit: 2654

Docket No.: 2001-0105

CONCLUSION

Having addressed all rejections, Applicants respectfully submit that the subject application is in condition for allowance and a Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 21, 2005

Correspondence Address:
Customer No. 49637
AT&T Corp.
Room 2A-207
One AT&T Way
Bedminster, NJ 07921

Richard C. Irving Attorney for Applicants Reg. No. 38, 499 Phone: 410-414-3056

By: Richard C. Jonny

Fax No.: 410-510-1433